

## REMARKS

All outstanding requirements will now be addressed in the order they appear in the Office Action mailed August 14, 2007.

### *Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102*

**1-2.** Claims 12, 14, 16, 18, 19, 21, 23, 25, and 27 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 5,332,981 to Mazzochette et al. (“Mazzochette”).

Applicants respectfully disagree because Mazzochette does not teach or recite a temperature compensation attenuator comprising a base **6**; a film thermistor **1** having two ends, having a top side and a bottom side, and being disposed on said base **6**; a film resistor **2** having two ends, and having a top side and a bottom side; an input terminal **3**; an output terminal **4**; and a ground terminal **5**; wherein said input terminal **3** and said output terminal **4** are connected to said two ends of said film thermistor **1**; the top side of the film resistor **2** is electronically connected to the bottom side of the film thermistor **1**; and the bottom side of the film resistor **2** is electronically connected to the ground terminal **5**.

Nevertheless and solely to expedite the prosecution of claims deemed allowable by the Examiner, Applicants have amended claim 12 to further distinguish from Mazzochette. Specifically, claim 12 has been amended to require that the film thermistor **1** have a non-zero temperature coefficient, and that the film resistor **2** have a temperature coefficient of about zero. These limitations distinguish claim 12 from Mazzochette because Mazzochette reaches or recites that the temperature coefficients of both resistors are inherently non-zero as they are selected in a way so that the attenuator changes at a controlled rate with changes in temperature while the impedance of the attenuator remains substantially constant. Mazzochette does not teach or recite a combination of a thermistor and a resistor.

***Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103***

**3-5.** Claims 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Mazzochette. The rejection is moot in light of the Applicants' amendments to claim 12 and arguments.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Applicants note with appreciation that the Examiner considers claims 13, 15, 20, 22, 24, 26, and 28 to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants have so rewritten these claims.

***CONCLUSION***

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration is respectfully solicited. Should an extension of time be required, Applicants hereby petition for same and request that the extension fee and any other fee required for timely consideration of this submission be charged to **Deposit Account No. 503182** unless paid for concurrently via EFS-Web.

Customer Number: **33,794**

Respectfully Submitted,

/Matthias Scholl/

Dr. Matthias Scholl, Esq.  
Reg. No. 54,947  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Date: November 21, 2007